

up with religion, whose members are scattered in a vast Diaspora and whose homeland—politically independent since 1991 but economically dependent on neighboring Turkey—is surrounded by hostile Muslim states. And while some Armenians sympathize with the Palestinians, others privately concede their fear of Muslim fundamentalism.

But for all their affinity with the Jews, Armenians are deeply wounded by Israel's refusal to recognize the genocide—a result, says Oron, of Turkish pressure. Israel looks to Turkey as an ally against Muslim extremism, and owes it a debt for allowing Syrian Jews to escape across its territory in the 1980s. And so no government wreath has ever been laid at the Mt. Zion memorial. And Israel TV has repeatedly banned a documentary film about the Armenians, "Passage to Ararat."

Though there are cracks in the government's silence—on the 80th anniversary of the massacre this past April 24, for example, Absorption Minister Yair Tzaban joined an Armenian demonstration at the Prime Minister's Office—the ambivalence persists. Last year, the Education Ministry commissioned Oron to write a high school curriculum on the Armenian and Gypsy genocides. But then, only two weeks before the curriculum was to be experimentally implemented, the ministry abruptly backtracked. A ministry-appointed commission of historians (none of them Armenian experts) claimed that Oron's textbook contained factual errors about the Gypsies and didn't present the Turkish perspective on the Armenians. A spokesman for the ministry says a new textbook will be commissioned.

While Oron is careful to avoid accusing the ministry of political motives. Armenians are far less reticent. Says Hintlian: "Obviously there is Turkish pressure. If the Turks get away with their lie, it will strengthen the Holocaust deniers, who will see that if you are persistent enough a large part of humanity will believe you."

So long as the Turks claim the genocide never happened, the Armenians will likely remain riveted to their trauma.

Bishop Guregh Kapikian is principal of the Armenian school. When he speaks of 1915 his head thrusts forward, voice quivering. His cheeks are hollowed, his chin ends in a white-goated point—a face gnawed by grief and sharpened by rage.

Kapikian, born in Jerusalem, was 3 when his father, a historian, died of pneumonia, having been weakened from the death march he'd survived. Kapikian eventually became a priest—"to be a soldier of the spirit of the Armenian nation."

Are you concerned, I ask, that your students may learn to hate Turks?

"The Turks have created hatred. Our enemy is the whole Turkish people."

But didn't some Turks help Armenians?

"They weren't real Turks. Maybe they were originally Christian, Armenian."

If Turkey should someday admit its crimes, could you forgive them?

"They can't do that. They're not human. What can you expect from wild beasts?"

There are other Armenian voices.

George Sandrouni, 31, runs a ceramics shop outside the compound. He sells urns painted with clusters of grapes, tiles with horsemen and peacocks, chess boards garlanded with pale blue flowers.

As a boy, he feared everyone he knew would disappear. The son of a man who survived the genocide as an infant, Sandrouni grew up with no close relatives, all of whom were killed in 1915. He resolved that when he married he would have 20 children, to fill the world with Armenians.

Now expecting his first child, he has become "more realistic, less paranoid." He

says: "The Turks have to be educated about the genocide. But we also have to learn how to deal with our past. I won't teach my children about the genocide as something abstract, like mathematics. I'll teach them that other people suffer; that some Turks helped Armenians; that evil is never with the majority. I'll try to keep the horror from poisoning their souls."•

#### CBO ESTIMATES ON INSULAR DEVELOPMENT ACT

• Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on June 30, 1995, I filed Report 104-101 to accompany S. 638, the Insular Development Act of 1995, that had been ordered favorably reported on June 28, 1995. At the time the report was filed, the estimates by Congressional Budget Office were not available. The estimate is now available and concludes that enactment is now available and concludes that enactment of S. 638 would result in no significant cost to the Federal Government and in no cost to State or local governments and would not affect direct spending or receipts. I ask that the text of the CBO estimate be printed in the RECORD.

The text follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
U.S. CONGRESS,  
Washington, DC, July 11, 1995.

Hon. FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,  
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed S. 638, the Insular Development Act of 1995, as reported by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on June 30, 1995. CBO estimates that S. 638 would result in no significant cost to the federal government and in no cost to state or local governments. Enacting S. 638 would not affect direct spending or receipts; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply.

S. 638 would restructure as agreement for making payments to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI). Presently, the federal government is obligated to make annual payments of \$27.7 million to CNMI. S. 638 would maintain that funding commitment but would expand the purposes for which those funds could be spent. Based on a 1992 agreement reached between CNMI and the federal government, CNMI would receive a declining portion of those funds for infrastructure development through fiscal year 2000. The remaining funds would be used for capital infrastructure projects in American Samoa in 1996 and in all insular areas in 1997 and thereafter. (Insular areas include Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, CNMI, the Republic of Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.) Of the funds designated for 1997 and thereafter, \$3 million would be designated for the College of the Northern Marianas in 1997 only, and \$3 million would be allocated each year to the Department of the Interior (DOI) for either federal or CNMI use in the areas of immigration, labor, and law enforcement. Additionally, beginning in fiscal year 1997, DOI would be required to prepare and update annually a five-year capital infrastructure plan for insular projects.

CBO estimates that the reallocation of funds that would occur under this bill would have little, if any, effect on the rates at which such funds are spent. CBO has no reason to expect that infrastructure funds used by other insular areas would be spent at a rate different from those used by CNMI. Also, based on information provided by the

DOI, CBO estimates that the bill's capital infrastructure planning requirement would result in no significant cost to the federal government.

S. 638 also would gradually apply the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) to CNMI, which would require enforcement activity by the Department of Labor (DOL). The department expects that it would continue to receive annually \$800,000 of the CNMI funds allocated to DOI for immigration, labor, and law enforcement purposes. DOL uses these funds to train CNMI officials to enforce labor laws, while providing additional temporary enforcement assistance. Based on information from the DOL, CBO expects that DOL would continue to receive these funds under this bill and that they would be sufficient to conduct FLSA enforcement. Therefore, we estimate that no additional costs to the federal government would result from this provision.

Additionally, S. 638 would require that DOI continue to submit annually to the Congress a report on the "State of the Islands," as well as a report on immigration, labor, and law enforcement issues in CNMI. The bill also would make several clarifications to existing law and would require cooperation in immigration matters between CNMI and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. CBO estimates that these provisions would result in no significant cost to the federal government.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is John R. Righter, who can be reached at 226-2860.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,  
Director. •

#### ALBUQUERQUE TECHNICAL-VOCATIONAL INSTITUTE

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Albuquerque Technical-Vocational Institute, a community college in New Mexico that is celebrating its 30th year of service to the community.

T-VI's impressive growth has paralleled the expansion of the community it has served for 30 years. From its origins with 150 students in an old abandoned elementary school, Albuquerque Technical-Vocational Institute has matured to become New Mexico's second largest higher educational institution with 20,000 students at three campuses, and an additional satellite campus planned in Bernalillo County's South Valley.

The development of Albuquerque's silicon mesa and high-tech economic expansion would have been impossible without the high-tech training provided at T-VI. T-VI wisely seeks out the counsel of the business community to ensure that its programs and training facilities are state-of-the-art. T-VI is a leader in technical education in New Mexico, placing its graduates in working environments that have helped to expand the state's economy and enrich the community.

In a community noted for its cultural diversity, T-VI has become a model of educational advancement. T-VI graduates are at work in a variety of technical careers, trades and professions throughout New Mexico. They provide

needed technical assistance and services to a variety of industries including our National Labs.

Mr. President, for its outstanding accomplishments, I would like to commend the students, teachers and administration of the Albuquerque Technical-Vocational Institute for 30 years of service to the community and to the State of New Mexico.●

#### JOYCE FOUNDATION PRESIDENT'S SPEECH TO LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, a longtime friend of mine, Lawrence Hansen, vice president of the Joyce Foundation, sent me a copy of a speech made by Deborah Leff, the president of the Joyce Foundation, on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the League of Women Voters of the State of Illinois.

The subject of her address is campaign financing.

It contains material that would be startling to most citizens though, unfortunately, not startling to those of us who serve in the Senate.

While the bulk of her remarks are about campaign financing, I want to quote one item that is not. She says:

I am saddened by the media's increasing tendency to exploit, entertain and titillate, leaving us less informed about public affairs and more cynical about politics.

She announces that the Joyce Foundation will make a 3-year, \$2.3 million special study on money and politics.

While the emphasis of her project will be the State of Illinois, clearly she draws lessons from what has happened at the national level, and we should draw lessons beyond the State of Illinois.

For example, she says:

In 1976, the average cost of winning a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives was less than \$80,000. Last year, it leveled off at \$525,000. Between 1990 and 1992 alone, the cost of winning a House seat jumped by 33 percent. In fact, 45 House candidates in 1994 spent over \$1 million each.

On PACs, Ms. Leff says:

To understand the competitive effects of the current campaign finance system, consider the giving habits of political action committees—PACs. Last year, PACs distributed close to \$142 million to House candidates, three-quarters of which went to incumbents. To appreciate the enormity of this bias, it's worth noting that the winning candidates last year raised more money from PACs than their challengers generated from all sources, including from PACs, individual contributors, their own donations and loans.

She is concerned, as we should be concerned, the present system of financing campaign makes our political institutions unrepresentative. She observes:

The skewed distribution of political money is not just a problem for challengers. There's another—and some would argue more pernicious—side to this imbalance. The campaign finance system favors wealthy candidates over poor candidates, male candidates over female candidates, and white candidates over African-American and Latino candidates. And this bias continues

to be reflected in the composition of many legislative bodies.

Although less than one-half of one percent of the American people are millionaires, there are today at least 72 millionaires in the U.S. House of Representatives and 29 in the U.S. Senate. (And these figures don't include Michael Huffington, who spent \$5 million of his own money to win a House seat in 1992 and an additional \$28 million last year in his failed bid to become a Senator.) There is something terribly wrong when millionaires are over-represented in the "People's House" by a factor of 3,000 percent and in the Senate by a factor of more than 5,000 percent.

The president of the Joyce Foundation also notes something every one of us knows to be the fact:

Candidates' increased reliance on television ads has led to less informative and more mean-spirited campaigns. We are told that attack ads work; they must, because why else would candidates invest so much money in this stuff? But who really benefits and at what cost to the political system? The public is fed slivers of information, often deceptively presented. Real issues are not discussed. The most obvious victim, of course, is a political tradition that once prided itself in allowing serious candidates to debate serious issues in a serious way.

Then, she says something that I do not know to be a fact, but, as far as I know, it is accurate. She tells her audience:

The United States is the only major democracy that neither restricts the amount of money candidates can spend on broadcast advertising nor regulates their access to and use of this powerful medium. As a result, the quality of the nation's political discourse has declined sharply. And so, too, has the public's confidence in the veracity and judgment of our leaders.

A minor correction I would make to her speech is that she refers to \$100 million being spent to defeat health care. Newsweek magazine uses the figure \$400 million, and I believe that Newsweek magazine is correct.

She also notes:

In 1992, half of all the money raised by congressional candidates—\$335 million—was provided by one-third of 1 percent of the American people.

Deborah Leff has a number of illustrations of the abuses. They include references to my friend, the former speaker of the Illinois House, Michael Madigan, and the current speaker of the Illinois House, Lee Daniels. What Michael Madigan and Lee Daniels are doing is using the present system. I do not fault them for that. But what Ms. Leff is saying is that the system should be changed, and I agree with her.

She does not call for any specific program of change.

My own belief is that at the Federal level, we have to have dramatic change, and it will not come about without the President of the United States really pushing for change. The system I would like to have is a check-off contribution of \$3 or \$5 on our income tax that would go to major candidates for the Senate and the House, and no other money could be spent. Then, in a State like Illinois, instead of spending \$8 million or \$10 million on a

campaign, the candidates could spend \$2 million, and have some required free time made available by radio and televisions, not for 30-second spots, but for statements of up to five minutes by the candidates in which there is a serious discussion of the issues.

I ask that the full Deborah Leff speech be printed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues of both parties and their staffs to read the Deborah Leff speech.

The material follows:

SPEECH OF DEBORAH LEFF, PRESIDENT, THE JOYCE FOUNDATION AT THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF ILLINOIS—JUNE 2, 1995

#### INTRODUCTION

I am delighted to be here this evening and to play a small role in celebrating the 75th anniversary of the founding of the League of Women Voters. No organization in this century has contributed more to expanding informed citizen participation in the political process and can legitimately claim more victories for democracy than the league. Yours is a proud legacy, and I salute you.

Through the years the Joyce Foundation has frequently partnered with the league. We have labored together to simplify the Nation's voter registration laws—and despite some unseemly footdragging here in the land of Lincoln and several other States, we have made real progress. I read in the newspaper a few weeks ago that in the few months since the Motor Voter Act was put into effect early this year, two million new voters have been registered. Two million. It's a wonderful number. And you should be very proud.

Joyce also stood with the league in its efforts to institutionalize presidential debates, and happily that has occurred.

Two years ago, we supported the "wired for democracy" project. This collaborative effort, involving the national league and a number of State and local chapters, has been exploring ways of making greater use of communication technologies to meet the informational needs of citizens.

And last year we joined forces with you in an ambitious experiment to make the Illinois gubernatorial race more issue-oriented. The goal was to enable the people of Illinois to identify their major policy concerns, frame an issues agenda, and engage the candidates for Governor in a conversation about their visions and plans for the State's future. That the candidates took less notice of these citizens' messages than they should have only confirms how desperately we need new and inventive ways for reconnecting people and their elected representatives. The "Illinois voter project" was a valiant and useful attempt to bridge that gulf, and Joyce was glad to play a part.

#### A CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE

Will Rogers once wrote, "I don't make jokes, I just watch the government and report the facts." And although we have much to celebrate tonight, there are a lot of facts to report. And, unfortunately, they're not funny. A terrible malaise has settled over our democracy. The fact is millions of our fellow citizens are fed up with politics. They feel left out, disconnected, unheard, unappreciated and powerless. And in frustration and anger, they are abandoning the system in droves. The signs of discontent are myriad. I'll mention only a few:

Three out of four Americans today say they "trust government in Washington" only "some of the time" or "almost never." In the mid-1960s, only 30 percent—rather than 75 percent—of Americans felt that way. (Roper Organization)